

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/961,147	09/24/2001	Takushi Fujita	1573.1007	1573.1007 5366	
21171 75	90 09/21/2006		EXAMINER		
STAAS & HA SUITE 700	LSEY LLP	VU, THANH T			
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20005		2174		
	·		DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/961,147	FUJITA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thanh T. Vu	2174		

	Thanh T. Vu		2174	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover s	heet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE TH	• •		•	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to this application, applicant must timely file one of the places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comtime periods:	or on the same day as fi following replies: (1) an a Notice of Appeal (with	iling a Notice of amendment, aff appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 CI	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expires Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MI	this Advisory Action, or (2) xpire later than SIX MONTH (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BC	the date set forth IS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1. NOTICE OF APPEAL	e date on which the petition of extension and the corresof the shortened statutory pe re later than three months at	sponding amount eriod for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	extension thereof (37 C	FR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final reject (a) They raise new issues that would require furth (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE (c) They are not deemed to place the application appeal; and/or	er consideration and/or s E below);	search (see NO	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without cancel NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CF	•	ber of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CF		lotice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would</li></ul>	• • •	d in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment( how the new or amended claims would be rejected The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:			ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final acti- because applicant failed to provide a showing of go was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of entered because the affidavit or other evidence faile showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is nec</li> </ol>	ed to overcome all rejection	ons under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the consideration of the co				
The request for reconsideration has been consider See Continuation Sheet.	ed but does NOT place t	the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s). (PTO/SB/08) Pape	г No(s)		
13.  Other:		Bust KRIST	tine Kinicai	d
		SUPERVISOR'	y patent examiner DGY Center 2100	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No. 09/961.147

Continuation of 3. NOTE: New issues: "changing the display priority of a particular linked content item of an information object based upon the geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object" in claims 8, 9, 11, 13 and 26 had never been presented before.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's primary argument is that Mackinlay does not teach "generating the respective pieces of intermediate data for displaying a particular linked content item of the information object, according to a geometric relation between said visual filed and said particular link content item of the information object"

The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, Mackinlay reads on the claim language of intermediate data generating means to generate the respective pieces of intermediate data for displaying a particular linked content item of the information object, according to a geometric relation between said visual filed and said particular link content item of the information object (figs. 15 and 16; col. 3, lines 43-57; col. 11, lines 20-30 and lines 57-67; col. 12, lines 20-55; linked documents are displayed at certain coordinate in reference to a viewed document (see, col. 11, lines 19-30). Furthermore, the linked documents are displayed in a specific order based on the various level of their linked contents (see, fig. 15 and 16; depth 1510 and 1511).